Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

feature, and the means used to accomplish the same end is a striking instance of the diversity in nature. While in one species it is a poisonous honey which intoxicates the insect and causes it to fall into the tube; in another it is, perhaps, a poisonous secretion of the flower, which answers the same purpose; in a third, it is a baited pathway which lures the insect to destruction and a stupefying liquid which decomposes the bodies of the same; and in a fourth, it is the simulation of the wings of an insect, as well as honey and a baited pathway which attracts the prey. What doubt can there be, but that all these contrivances subserve the same end? And when, too, we consider the curious relation between the flower and the leaf in Darlingtonia, and the very different shape of the flower in Sarracenia, we see there must be still other facts to be discovered. Such an abnormal stigma as is possessed by the Sarracenia can not but be of some use. With its broad, flat table like expansion, most effectually concealing the stamens behind it, it is utterly incapable of self fertilization. There must be some relation between it and the leaves, but what this is, is at present a mystery. Then to trace the evolution of the leaves from the normal shape to the present peculiar one, would be of interest, but space forbids, and leaving this matter for some future time we take leave of this fascinating subject.

——:o:——

EDITORS' TABLE.

EDITORS: A. S. PACKARD, JR., AND E. D. COPE.

—— Owing to the almost isolated position of the United States as a nation, there is less stimulus to the development of a sentiment of nationality here than in the case of the European nations. Emulation and rivalry have had a great deal to do with progress in Europe. It has been asserted that the absence of such competition on this continent will work to the injury of the advancement of the United States, in matters intellectual at least. It is true that the character of our institutions is such as to stimulate the energetic prosecution of enterprises in all directions; but success here will only meet with financial rewards, unless there be some sentiment of national pride in the results of intellectual success, which is not directly connected with the making of money. For the successful discoverer in the field of pure science, Europe has greater rewards than America.

The recognition of work of merit, judged from the intellectual standpoint, must however begin with the votaries of such pursuits, for the general public cannot be expected of themselves to appreciate the situation. And here it is that American scientists are largely behind their European colleagues. It is true that our transatlantic friends are often, either through neglect or design, unjust in their preferences in giving credit to their own men, where it is due to those of other nations. But where but in America do we see the situation reversed, and credit given to foreigners when it is due to American brains and American thought? This is not now so much the case as it was formerly, but a serious defect still exists. American writers in the field of biology at least (we do not know how it is in the other departments), are by no means up to the sociological standard of Europeans in crediting their colleagues and countrymen with their work. The perusal of a German monograph is rendered doubly pleasing, from the constant references to other workers therein contained, as though the author were doubly anxious to credit others, and to avoid the appearance of appropriating as his own, the results of the ideation of other brains. There is policy as well as principle involved in this method. The author by exclusion shows what is original with himself, and in addition proves to the reader his familiarity with the literature of the subject. The same feature is usual in all works by first-class European authors.

This mode of treating the work of others is the result of social evolution, and it has reached a fuller development in Europe than in North America. It is no doubt, in part, a consequence of the greater number of scientists necessarily produced by several nations as compared with a single one, and from their frequent personal intercourse; and also from the sentiment of nationality which leads every one to desire to bring to light the best products of his country to the view of others.

—— The question of the "origin of the fittest" is claiming more attention in Europe than it did during the purely Darwinian period. We had occasion in the April, 1882, number of the NATURALIST to refer to the remarks of Professor DuBois Raymond in his lecture on Exercise, in which he traced the origin of some structures to the movements or exercises of their possessors. In a recent able exposition of the nature of the vertebrate skull,[1] Professor H. G. Seeley, of London, uses the following significant language: " * The only key to the history of these transformations is found in the law that function modifies, moulds and originates structures on the basis of antecedent organizations; * *."

---

[1] A paper read before the Science Society of Kings' College, London, Oct. 31, 1882.

Professor Grant Allen, in his book on the Colors of Flowers, in the Nature series, goes behind the law of natural selection in the following words:[1] "Not only can we say why such a color, once happening to appear, has been favored in the struggle for existence, but why that color should ever make its appearance in the first place, which is a condition precedent to its being favored or selected at all." * * "May we not say that it ought always to be the object of naturalists in this manner to show not only why such and such a spontaneous variation should have been favored wherever it occurred, but also to show why and how it could ever have occurred at all?"

As if to contribute to this view of evolution, Dr. Hubrecht, of Leyden, endeavors to show in a recent lecture, published in *Nature*, the importance of Acceleration as a factor in the development of organic forms.

——The best advice to the biologist of the present day is that he should work as though time were eternity. The best work in art or literature is done by those who have a genius for patient, careful, thoughtful labor, expended on methods and minor details as well as in elaborating the central idea before them. The motto of the biologist should be *Festina lente*, and the charge on the field of his shield should be a turtle. Undoubtedly the Germans, whether botanists or zoölogists, are at the head of the world's workers in biological science. This is not so much because of their superior talent or genius, but because of their lack of nervousness and impulsiveness, which induces an admirable patience and a commendable slowness and calmness, and yet well sustained enthusiasm during their work. These qualities in minds of even average calibre, bring about excellent results. German monographs, despite their verbiage and prolixity, are nearly always solid contributions to science.

It may be well asked how far our American nervousness and impetuosity, and eagerness for immediate results impede or impair our success in scientific work of a high order. Our best naturalists have been those who have worked most thoroughly and with the least nervous haste. In the field of anatomy, histology, morphology and embryology, as well as physiology, the qualities of patience, lack of haste, and minute analysis are all important. Hence these departments of biology, which are naturally the most difficult, are the most disciplinary, the most exacting. Their pursuit places biology perhaps on a level with the purely physical sciences; and in these latter years of the second half century, biology has, with its instruments of precision, nearly, if not quite, gained a place beside mathematical and allied studies as an exact science.

---

[1] Page 119.